United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SHERMAN DIVISION

DOMAIN PROTECTION, LLC,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 4:18-cv-792
	§	Judge Mazzant
SEA WASP, LLC, ET. AL.	§	
Defendants.	§	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Domain Protection LLC's Motion to Modify Judgment (Dkt. #412). Having considered the motion and the relevant pleadings, the Court finds that Domain Protection's Motion is **DENIED**.

Motions to reconsider serve a very limited purpose: "to permit a party to correct manifest errors of law or fact, or to present newly discovered evidence." *Krim v. pcOrder.com, Inc.*, 212 F.R.D. 329, 331 (W.D. Tex. 2002) (citations omitted). Mere disagreement with a district court's order does not warrant reconsideration of that order. *Id.* at 332. A party should not restate, recycle, or rehash arguments that were previously made. *Id.* District court opinions "are not intended as mere first drafts, subject to revision and reconsideration at a litigant's pleasure." *Verdin v. Fed. Nat'l. Mortg. Ass'n*, No. 4:10-cv-590, 2012 WL 2803751, at *1 (E.D. Tex. July 10, 2012) (citations omitted). The Court already considered Domain Protection's argument and found it unpersuasive. The Court's preliminary injunction ordered Sea Wasp to undo any changes to the Domain Names' nameserver records. This meant that Sea Wasp was ordered to return any converted Domain Names to Domain Protection. Sea Wasp complied with that mandate. Domain Protection's request is accordingly denied.

¹ As the Court previously stated, "should Sea Wasp reinstitute an executive lock on the Domain Names in an impermissible manner, Domain Protection will be well within its right to file a new action seeking another injunction" (Dkt. #402)

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Plaintiff Domain Protection LLC's Motion to Modify Judgment (Dkt. #412) is hereby **DENIED**.

SIGNED this 13th day of July, 2020.

AMOS L. MAZZANT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE